

Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
February 9, 2016

Topic/Discussion	Action
<p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:00 PM.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes</u> President Wilson asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of January 12, 2016.</p>	<p>The minutes were approved as written.</p>
<p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u> There were no items of new business raised.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson</u> President Wilson updated on the state budget appropriation news. There is no appropriation decided yet. The University will have to do something soon, such as in 2011, when we wrote letters, contacted politicians, and asked advice of our political scientists to advise us further.</p> <p>We will have a report and we will be voting on a motion from Senate PBC adopted at their last meeting. Due to the state budget impasse, things are not working as we are used to at the SBPC. The motion that will be voted on is about a review of the university budget system.</p> <p>President Wilson also noted that a COACHE (Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) survey of faculty was sent via Read Green from the Provost's Office. It is important for us to respond to this survey. An announcement also went out related to the Research Committee, with two open forum Town Hall meetings (Feb 18th, Feb 23rd) that will focus on patent, conflict of interest, and copyright policies related to research. The different research groups at the University are getting closer in alignment.</p> <p>An event took place in September 2015 related to the Strategic Planning Process: the Academically-Based Community Engagement Idea Exchange. Community-based and applied researchers shared experiences, as this group is affected by research decisions. A tab on the Senate Website links to an article about this event. This type of activity fuses community engagement with research endeavors- two parts of our new Strategic Plan. Professor Toto (Community Relations Committee Co-Chair) noted that the CRC is made of faculty and the community. They have been discussion how their work focuses on what is important at the university and across our campuses to make a significant impact with research.</p> <p>A pre-Plenary event was held last month that was well-attended. The planning for the March 30th Plenary is going very well, and details are being finalized. Our guest speaker is Henry (Hank) Reichman from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Our panel of our own faculty includes Michael Goodhart and Beverly Gaddy, and former Provost James Maher.</p> <p>Standing and adhoc Senate Committees are sending in reports and there is a lot of work occurring. We will get regular reports in a more deliberate fashion at upcoming meetings. One such group is the ad hoc committee on NTS part-time faculty. We began</p>	<p>Discussion notes are recorded below.</p>

to look at numbers and salaries of part-time faculty at Pitt, and it became evident that part-time faculty at regional campuses were out-of-line with the university at large, and the markets where our campuses are. The Provost announced just a few weeks ago that some of the academic initiative funds are being earmarked to try to raise the standard for part-time faculty at regional campuses, as well as lecturers in Oakland. Career advancement and salary increases are underway. These are examples of small steps taken that show a pattern of responsiveness of administration. Professor Irene Frieze, chair of the NTS workgroup, noted that some faculty come back year-after-year, and they are called “recurring faculty.” They are different than one-time teachers or focused content experts. We are trying to determine how to classify and name them; if anyone has ideas about naming them, please see Irene.

President Wilson also noted that a report from the Chancellor-initiated Senate Council Group on Diversity and Inclusion was distributed to Faculty Assembly for review for today’s meeting. At the November 2015 Senate Council meeting, the Chancellor, in a discussion about events taking place on college campuses across the country related to inclusion, asked the Senate Council to take a look at this issue in the context of campus life at Pitt. The Senate Council, which is comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrations, was a good starting place to initiate this discussion. A smaller workgroup was formed out of Senate Council with Kathy Humphrey and Pam Connelly to work on this. The group met and President Wilson noted it was a pleasure to work on that committee due to its composition and serious discussion, as well as energy around this issue. The group came up with the shared report and recommendation (four recommendations). We all are going back to our constituents and then we will discuss this in detail at our next Faculty Assembly Meeting in March. Please review this document. At Senate Council next month, this will also be discussed and voted on.

Question/Discussion:

Stoner: Related to community engagement, it is possible to add as a course attribute the phrase “community engagement” as a component of the course, so students see this aspect of a course.

Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate

Budget Policies Committee (BPC):

Process to Initiate a Review of the Planning & Budget Document

Professor Beverly Gaddy, Chair

Professor Gaddy presented a resolution from the SBPC (from their January 15, 2016 meeting) related to a periodic review every five years of the University’s planning and budgeting system (PBS). This review helps to ensure broad participation by faculty, staff and students, in the University planning and budgeting process. The University planning and budgeting system was originally adopted by the University on October 1, 1992. As part of the original document, a review every five years is recommended. As stated in the full document that was provided in advance of the Faculty Assembly meeting, the last formal review occurred in 2003, and then the next one was delayed due to change with the Chancellor. Now it is a good time to initiate this review process. The BPC discussed this and unanimously voted to ask the Faculty Assembly to initiate this review process.

Discussion notes are recorded below.

The resolution from the Senate BPC was unanimously passed as written.

Resolution by SBPC (2/9/16): [full document posted to Senate website]

“RESOLVED that the Faculty Assembly approve a motion to direct the Senate President to appoint a small ad hoc committee, consisting of faculty and members of the Council of Deans, to review the PBS document and propose revisions of it to the University Senate and Council of Deans for action.”

Questions/Discussion:

Frieze: Do you have any reasons to think the policy needs to be changed?

Gaddy: Yes, some of it is out-of-date, some is repetitive, and some is not realistic anymore. It should be more reflective of how we do things.

Bircher: A portion of the changes to consider is a mechanism to ensure that each and every unit that is supposed to have a BPC has one, with elections, a meeting schedule and minutes. These are technical modifications, but one of the reasons the current policy cannot be enforced is that there is not an accountability mechanism for the committee.

Gaddy: It is difficult for the Senate BPC to have oversight on this across schools and units. They hope to put more mechanisms into the policy to make it have more teeth and be enforceable.

DeJong: We need to do a better job centrally to make sure local committees do what is expected. The streamlining and redundancy omission will make it easier for the units to follow.

Wilson: This was discussed at the last Senate BPC meeting. We do not want this to be a big unwieldy committee, so we came up with a more informal ad hoc starting group. We have met already (Beverly Gaddy, Wes Rohrer, Dave DeJong, Frank Wilson) to do a check on this system. We have gone through an initial review and have ideas of changes that might be needed. We will open this up for larger discussion as well. Administration and faculty are aware that all units are not following the process. We want it to be followed and this is the mechanism to create a process that can be better adhered to. The goal is a more functional, practical document.

Muenzer: Stylistic changes are content changes. Is “all units not following” anecdotal or based on data? Do we have numbers on this? This could be a significant issue.

Wilson: I think that is where this process is headed. There is anecdotal evidence, but a lot of anecdotes add up. We are going to look through the University to see if this is being followed and we have not done that for a long time.

DeJong: We will be surveying to gather these data while we are revising the document.

Muenzer: Will your approach be different within units and departments? If many units are ignoring this, that is substantive. Different changes may be suggested if 3/30 are ignoring versus 20/30. Should the survey data be collected before you begin?

<p>DeJong: The current document affords the PBC to review units for their process. With a revised document, we will have information to get everyone to a uniform standard. We do see the annual updates of the Strategic Plan at the Provost's office, so we have a good sense of what is not occurring.</p> <p>Spring: I laud the effort and wish you luck. The last time BPC did a review was related to the CAS department closings. There should be, at this level of Senate PBC and University PBC, appropriate controls for the Senate to be involved. As we move down the ladder, there is less money to work with, and the arguments are tougher. Professor Spring stated that he hopes they find a way to get a sense of the extent to which the grass-roots faculty feel appropriate engaged in this, with the survey that is going to be done. Involvement at the lower levels has been felt as lacking, in the past.</p> <p>Muenzer: In our Department, we spend significant time talking about small amounts of money, and qualitative issues are attached to these discussions. Faculty involvement is tough, and there will be a huge diversity of opinion.</p> <p>Wilson: This motion is brought before us from one of our Standing Committees, the Senate SPBC. A vote was taken and the resolution was unanimously approved. No abstentions.</p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p> <p><u>Proposed Guidelines for Sexual Harassment Training for Faculty and Staff</u> Frank Wilson, Senate President</p> <p>Provost Beeson asked that Senate review and endorse the distributed guidelines for sexual harassment training for faculty and staff. The guidelines were recommended by the ad hoc committee charged in March 2015 to review and recommend appropriate changes to the University policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct, and were subsequently endorsed by the Council of Deans at their November 2015 meeting. The recommendations and guidelines developed from the ad hoc committee were provided to Faculty Assembly prior to the meeting, and are posted to the Senate website.</p> <p>Professor Frieze noted that additional documents are to come. We hope to have them by mid-late March, so we can review, discuss, and approved content this academic year. The documents for today's Faculty Assembly are related to training.</p> <p>President Wilson asked all of the Faculty Assembly to review these recommendations.</p> <p><u>Questions/Discussion:</u></p> <p>Kear: This was discussed at the last Admissions and Student Affairs Meeting. They support this, and wonder if this should be done more than once every four years, as is stated in the document. They also wondered if different perceptions across cultures should be considered in the training content.</p> <p>Rohrer: What are the accountability mechanisms for this?</p> <p>Connelly: The Office for Diversity and Inclusion will develop accountability and tracking mechanisms for this.</p>	<p>Discussion notes recorded below.</p> <p><i>The Training Recommendations were approved by majority vote. There were 3 abstentions.</i></p>

Schmidhofer: Is there evidence to show that this training is effective?

Connelly: The courts and the government tell us that we have to do this education to be compliant, and we want to do this training because it affects people down the road. We will have a menu of options in different formats for all.

Triulzi: The source of harassment is often from other students, and if we solve faculty and staff, is there a role for the faculty in addressing the student piece? That is not discussed here.

Connelly: That is a terrific idea.

Constantino: At least tell us what is being prepared for students for each other.

Connelly: Katie Pope, or Title IX Coordinator, is working on a four-year plan for students and that can come back to a future meeting.

Bratman: Contextually, with respect to defining sexual harassment, it is defined clearly in the policy for faculty-student relationship. Is the student-student harassment defined differently or being explored in response to the climate?

Connelly: There is sexual harassment in Title VII (employment), so the definition comes from that. Title IX talks about gender harassment and covers this as well. The Committee is working on a proposal to revise our documents to reflect Title VII and Title IX better and reduce discrimination.

Bratman: One of the recommendations (#2) notes that “the majority of the committee” agrees. What did the minority want – more frequent or less frequent training?

Connelly: The minority wanted more frequent training.

Munro: The survey does not talk about faculty-staff harassment. Have there been questions about that? Does the training cover that?

Connelly: The training addresses both. There has not been a formal climate survey for faculty or staff on sexual harassment.

Munro: There have been issues as we all know, so this issue is something we should know about.

Frieze: There is some knowledge of this through formally reported cases. We tried to craft a document that applies to everyone.

Muenzer: I have a question about “we” versus “majority.” If votes were taken, what was the procedure taken? Does it need to be unanimous? Anyone reading that document will come to the view that the “we” carries more weight than the majority. This is one of the most important of the recommendations. Do all of these have to be unanimous?

Frieze: Most of the decisions were by consensus vote. In cases where there was disagreement, a compromise was drafted and we voted on the compromise.

Savinov: I read the document and spoke with my colleagues. I feel obliged to explain why I am voting against this or will abstain. This is hard for me to explain. The things that raise my concerns: I see 6000 students surveyed; 11% reported harassment by faculty members. Do we have a problem or do we have misunderstandings? I am all in favor of doing lots of things to punish those who do this. I believe that training itself is not going to change anything. Like with Jerry Sandusky- it would not have changed his behavior. Most universities and businesses are working in the wrong direction. Because this is misdirected, I do not think the document is in the right direction at this time.

Frieze: We did not use the term sexual harassment in the survey; respondents marked reports of certain acts that occurred.

Connelly: The entire survey is on-line and the harassment term encompasses many different acts. A secondary benefit of this is the education of all of the people that take the training. Expectations of the University are defined by training like this. A true bad actor may not be changed, but this gives us a tool to discuss behavior with them for action.

Savinov: What could be perceived by someone else is a dangerous path. An example is related to spiritual beliefs – there is chance this could come next in a policy. I am all in favor of severe punishment, but I am against policies that do nothing.

Connelly: Religious discrimination and harassment is not permitted by law.

Frieze: There is a federal requirement that we have this training in place.

Loughlin: I was shocked that anyone would send their children to Pitt when I first read the survey results. I went to the on-line document; it is 500 pages. The summary is fine, but the study focuses on two categories: non-consensual sexual contact/ assault, and if someone took offense to a comment. The news is better than this summary, as the data are grouped together. If we are out of compliance with the law, we need to do this training. Or, does our existing training covering this? The two categories are important. It is hard for me to vote yes or no without knowing what the content is being aimed at and how effective it is going to be. What is the training to ensure that not one student is offended by a silly comment versus a sexual assault?

Connelly: The data are not that the events occurred one-time.

Loughlin: It is hard to train everyone to never say anything that could be misconstrued.

Connolly: The idea is to create a menu of training sessions to learn about sexual harassment but it is to take affirmative steps to create an environment free of discrimination.

Spring: I want to echo something. I wish I had not seen the appendix again. I continue to be bothered by things. There are a variety of things people do, and a variety of actors and victims. I think we need to get started and start now, and get better every year. What bothers me now, the harasser was a friend in 66% of the cases; and was a stranger it was over 40%. The numbers do not add up. We are asking for better clarity

on the definitions and data to better target the teaching. The summaries raise more questions for me, than provide answers. I hope this effort is ongoing. It is a 4x4 matrix of victims and harassers: faculty, administrators, staff, and students.

Bratman: I support the resolution because I have faith that the departments creating the training will do a good job. I share the view of others that the climate survey results are not indicating a severe of a problem as they seem to, based on the definition of harassment and selection bias. Harassment needs to be objectively defined and subjectively defined. I just don't know for sure how severe the incidences are. We need the training. I do support it. There is faculty misconduct going on.

Connelly: There is a robust analysis of response bias in the AAU report. I also thought the bias would be in reporting as well, but the AAU did a national analysis of this. On the whole, it looks like the bias goes in the other direction. The definition of sexual harassment is a legal definition. Do we want a definition to be only objective before victims can raise issue?

Rohrer: The content matters. I am not sure a training video will change behavior. It is important that we should support this as: a) it is required by the government; and b) this reflects the values of the University. Are there national figures that provide comparable benchmarks from other universities?

Connelly: The survey was a national survey. The Chancellor commented that the Pitt results were concerning, and our numbers are not good. Google Pitt AAU climate survey and you can find the data for all schools.

Schmidhofer: I would not spend any time revising surveys. We know this is a problem and if we ignore it we are naïve. It does not matter if we are lower than other places. All events are concerning. What we need is what can we do to make this go away? I do not think the conventional training will fix it, but we have to do it.

Norris: Our comparator is irrelevant. What can we do to make this better? Most of the individuals that have experienced harassment will never come forward. We need training to understand how to help victims to know that if they come forward they will not be punished. We know it is common and the percentages are irrelevant. As faculty members, we have no training and no confidence that coming forward is going to help. Let us get the training on how to respond to this and call out the misconduct. That is the training that I think is missing for faculty, students, and staff: reporting in a safe environment.

Connelly: Harassment training already includes this – what to do when you witness it. That is a great idea to include content on this.

Bircher: I strongly support the proposal, however I have one caution: other federally mandated programs do not work due to haphazard and superficial training. An example is the false claims act behavior. As we go down the road of training, just because it is federally mandated does not mean it works. We should develop a program that does work.

Weinberg: A quick google search showed there are papers studying the impact of harassment training in research data.

<p>Faculty comment: What about the high percentage of students who are doing the harassment? Is there any effort focusing on them?</p> <p>Connelly: There is a lot going on focused on students. Many efforts are underway.</p> <p>Wilson: The message that should go back is that we want this to be a substantive training for culture-altering behavior and what to do when we see it. I call the question: Do we support this recommendation from the Provost? Opposed: none; abstain: 3; approved: majority. The recommendation was approved with majority vote.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements</u></p> <p>No other announcements were made.</p>	None
<p><u>Adjournment</u></p> <p>The meeting was called to end by President Wilson.</p>	Adjournment at 4:24pm.

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:

<http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly>

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Skledar, RPh, MPH, FASHP

Senate Secretary

Associate Professor, School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy and Therapeutics

Members attending:

Bircher, Bratman, Buchanich, Cohen, Corral, Costantino, Dahm, Dewar, Donihi, Fort, Frieze, Gaddy, Goodhart, Groark, Guterman, Kaufman, Kear, Leers, Lin C., Loughlin, Marra, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Muenzer, Mulvaney, Munro, Nelson L., Norris, Ramsey, Rohrer, Savinov, Schmidhofer, Skledar, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Swanson, Tananis, Toto, Triulzi, Weinberg, Wilson, Withers, Yarger

Members not attending:

Alarcon, Clark, Falcione, Fusco, Gleason, Gold, Hartman, Helbig, Hravnak, Irrgang, Jones, Kanthank, Labrinidis, Lin J., Mauk, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, Nelson S., Olanyk, Poloyac, Scott, Smolinski, Velankar, Vieira, Weiss

***Excused attendance:**

Ataai, Beck, Cole, Czerwinski, Flynn, Frank, Horvath, Jacob, Kaynar, Kearns, Kovacs, Novy, Rea, Rigotti, Savoia,

Others attending/guests:

Barlow, Connelly, DeJong, Fedele, Gentz, Pope

*Notified Senate Office